

## **REMARKS**

Entry of the amendment proposed above, and reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and objections in light of such amendment and the following remarks, is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-3, 11-15, 28-31, 33-39, and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,160,631 (Okimoto et al.) Amended Claim 1 recites a system for remote printing comprising a local computer having at least one stored document being associated with at least one native data format. The native data format is other than a page descriptor format. The local computer is adapted for accepting a print request associated with the document. A remote computer is associated with a remote printer and is adapted for receiving the print request and automatically causing the document to be printed on the remote printer so that the native data format of the document is maintained in the document printed by the remote computer on the remote printer. Okimoto et al. does not disclose or suggest this arrangement. Okimoto et al., as pointed out by the Examiner, must utilize, or convert to, document data in a print data format, e.g., PDL. Amended Claim 1 specifically recites that the native data format is not a page descriptor format, that is, the native data format cannot be PDL. Okimoto et al. is unable to maintain document data in a non-page descriptor format through the printing process and Okimoto et al. must convert document data into page descriptor format for printing. There is no suggestion in Okimoto et al. that print data could be in another format, and by its specificity in Col. 11, lines 32-42, describing document data being converted into a page description format for printing, Okimoto et al. teaches away from the use of any other print format. Claim 1 is therefore believed to

patentably distinguish over the cited reference and is consequently believed to be allowable. Claims 2-3, dependent upon Claim 1, are also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 1 being allowable.

Amended Claim 11 recites a method for printing a document comprising the steps of receiving from a source computer a request to print a document and accepting polling signals from a plurality of destination computers with each of the destination computers being associated with at least one printer appearing on an ordered list of printers, responding to the polling signals by sending a print request to a destination computer associated with the first printer from the ordered list that is available for printing said document, receiving a print result signal from the destination computer, and sending the print result signal to the source computer. Okimoto et al. does not disclose or suggest the method as recited in Claim 11. Okimoto et al. is directed to an email-based data exchange system in which a destination computer utilizes an associated printer to print the mail message. Okimoto et al. does not describe or suggest the relationship between destination computers and an ordered (e.g., prioritized) list of printers in which a print request sent to a destination computer is printed on the first available printer from the list. Okimoto et al. only describes a one-to-one correspondence between a destination computer and a printer, and does nothing to suggest the computer - "list of printers" relationship recited in Claim 11. Claim 11 is therefore believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Claims 12-15, dependent upon Claim 11 are also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 11 being allowable.

Amended Claim 28 recites a system for remote printing comprising a local computer having at least one document stored thereon with the document being in a native data format

other than a page descriptor format. A remote printer receives data in a format other than the native data format and a remote computer is coupled to the local computer and is also coupled to and associated with the remote printer in order to receive and print the document. The local computer provides the document in the native data format, the remote computer receives the document in the native data format and the remote computer prints the document on the remote printer. As described above with respect to Claim 1, Okimoto et al. does not disclose or suggest that the remote computer receives document data for printing in a native data format, unless, by implication, the native data format is a page descriptor format. As Claim 28 specifically recites that the native data format is not a page descriptor format, Claim 28 cannot be anticipated by Okimoto et al. Applicants believe that Claim 28 clearly distinguishes over the cited reference and is therefore allowable. Claims 29-31, and Claims 33-35, dependent upon Claim 28, are also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 28 being allowable.

Independent Claim 36 has been amended to recite a method for remote printing of a document from a local computer, in a first format associated with an application by which the document is maintained, by a remote computer using a remote printer which receives data in a format different than the first format comprising the steps of providing the document from the local computer in the first format, receiving the document at the remote computer in the first format, and printing the document on the remote printer by the remote computer. Okimoto et al. does not disclose or suggest the method as recited in Claim 36. Claim 36 recites that the first format of the document is maintained through to the remote or destination computer, and then is printed by a printer that does not receive data in the first format. Okimoto et al., as

pointed out by the Examiner in Col. 11, lines 32-42, converts document data to printable page descriptor format data at the local or origin computer before it is sent to the remote or destination computer. Okimoto et al. therefore teaches away from that which is recited in Claim 36. Claim 36 is therefore believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Claims 37-41, dependent upon Claim 36, are also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 36 being allowable.

Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,287,434 (Bain et al.). Amended Claim 16 recites a method for printing a document comprising the steps of receiving from a source computer a request to print a document, detecting printer-enabled signals associated with one of a plurality of remote printers appearing on an ordered list of printers and, in response to the detecting, sending the print request to the remote printer that has the highest priority on the ordered list of remote printers from which the printer-enabled signals are associated. This method is not described or suggested by Bain et al. Bain et al. matches particular types of print jobs (e.g., bar code printing) with job-capable printers and prioritizes the print jobs with respect to a given printer. Claim 16, on the other hand, recites the prioritizing and assignment of printers to requested print jobs based on printer, not job, priority. Bain et al. therefore effectively teaches away from that which is recited in Claim 16. Claim 16 is therefore believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Claim 17, dependent upon Claim 16, is also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 16 being allowable.

Claims 4-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,287,194 (Lobiondo) in view of U.S. 5,580,177 (Gase et al.). Amended Claim 4 recites

a system comprising a network maintaining an ordered list of at least one local printer and at least one remote printer. A local computer is connectable to the local printers and in communication with the remote printers via the network. The local computer is adapted to accept a request to print a document and to detect whether the first local printer on the ordered list is available to print the document. If the first local printer is not available, the local computer successively detects whether subsequent local printers on the ordered list are available to print the document. If no local printer is available, the local computer successively detects whether subsequent remote printers on the ordered list are available to print the document. If a remote printer is detected as being available, the document is printed on that remote printer. Neither Lobiondo nor Gase et al. discloses or suggests such an arrangement. The list of printers disclosed and described in Gase et al. only show the printers installed on a network. Gase et al. does not show or suggest any order or priority to the listed printers, only that certain printers are available for selection. Claim 4 is directed to the manner, i.e., prioritizing, in which a printer is selected; Gase et al. does not suggest anything about prioritizing printers or the manner in which one printer is selected vis-à-vis another. Claim 4 is therefore believed to distinguish over the cited references and is consequently believed to be allowable. Claims 5-10, dependent upon Claim 4, are also believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 4 being allowable.

Claims 18-21 and 23-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al. in view of Okimoto et al. Claims 18-21 and 23-26, dependent or ultimately dependent upon independent Claim 16, are believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 16 being allowable.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al. in view of Okimoto et al. and further in view of U.S. 6,266,692 (Greenstein). Claim 22 is ultimately dependent upon Claim 16 and is therefore believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 16 being allowable.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al. in view of Okimoto et al. in view of Gase et al. Claim 27 is dependent upon Claim 16 and is therefore believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 16 being allowable.

Claims 32, 33, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okimoto et al. and in view of Greenstein. Claims 32 and 33 are dependent upon Claim 28 and are therefore believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 28 being allowable. Claim 40 is dependent upon Claim 36 and is therefore believed to be allowable by virtue of Claim 36 being allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references disclose or make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, all of the claims being believed to be allowable, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested with a passage of this application to allowance respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any questions about this submission or other matters, which may be addressed in that fashion.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /scott stevens/  
Scott J. Stevens, Reg. No. 29,446  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137  
(317) 713-4947